

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Office Action issued December 31, 2009, claims 13, 28, and 43 were objected to for depending on cancelled claims 12, 27, and 42 respectively. 1, 4-10, 13-16, 19-25, 28-31, 34-40, and 43-51 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,925,631 to Golden ("Golden") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,754,659 to Sarkar et al. ("Sarkar"), and further in view of Sijacic, U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2003/0158832 ("Sijacic").

Claims 1, 4-10, 13-16, 19-25, 28-31, 34-40, and 43-51 are now pending in this application. Claims 1, 13, 16, 28, 31, and 43 have been amended in order to clarify the subject matter that the Applicant considers to be the invention. No new matter has been added.

The applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 1, 4-10, 13-16, 19-25, 28-31, 34-40, and 43-51 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Golden in view of Sarkar and further in view of Sijacic, because even if Golden, Sarkar, and Sijacic were combined as suggested by the Examiner, the result still would not disclose or suggest the requirements of the claims.

For example, claims 1, 16, and 31 require creating an event handler that leverages multiple templates for a method node found in the markup language description. The Examiner cites Golden at col. 9, lines 37-41 as teaching an event handler that is called whenever an element is found in the stream. However, the cited portion of Golden fails to disclose that the event handler leverages multiple templates for a method node. Sarkar does not cure the deficiencies of Golden. Accordingly, the combination of Golden and Sarkar fails to disclose creating an event handler that leverages multiple templates for a

method node found in the markup language description. There is no disclosure in Sijacic of creating an event handler that leverages multiple templates for a method node found in the markup language description..

As a result, the combination of Golden, Sarkar, and Sijacic does not disclose or suggest creating an event handler that leverages multiple templates for a method node found in the markup language description.

Therefore, claim 1, and claims 16 and 31, which are similar to claim 1, and claims 4-10, 13-15, 19-25, 28-30, 34-40, and 43-51, which depend therefrom, are not unpatentable over Golden in view of Sarkar and further in view of Sijacic.

Each of the claims now pending in this application is believed to be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration of this case and early issuance of the Notice of Allowance are respectfully requested.

Additional Fees:

A Petition for an Extension of Time and fee is filed concurrently herewith extending the time period for response two months to May 31, 2010. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any insufficient fees or credit any overpayment associated with this application to Deposit Account No. 50-4545 (5231-087-US01).

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, all of the Examiner's rejections to the claims are believed to be overcome. The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and issuance of a Notice of Allowance for all the claims remaining in the application. Should

the Examiner feel further communication would facilitate prosecution, he is urged to call the undersigned at the phone number provided below.

Respectfully Submitted,

/Chadwick A. Jackson, Reg. No. 46,495/

Chadwick A. Jackson
Reg. No. 46,495

Dated: June 1, 2010

Hanify & King, Professional Corporation
1055 Thomas Jefferson St., N.W.
Suite 400
Washington, DC 20007
(202) 403-2100 Tel.
(202) 429-4380 Fax